

Drug Court for Juvenile Offenders

Program description:

While each drug court is unique, they all share the primary goals of reducing criminal recidivism and substance abuse among participants. Drug courts use comprehensive supervision, drug testing, treatment services, and immediate sanctions and incentives in an attempt to modify the criminal behavior of certain drug-involved defendants. These meta-analytic results were last updated in 2006.

Typical age of primary program participant: 15

Typical age of secondary program participant: N/A

Meta-Analysis of Program Effects

Outcomes Measured	Primary or Secondary Participant	No. of Effect Sizes	Unadjusted Effect Sizes (Random Effects Model)			Adjusted Effect Sizes and Standard Errors Used in the Benefit-Cost Analysis					
						First time ES is estimated			Second time ES is estimated		
			ES	SE	p-value	ES	SE	Age	ES	SE	Age
Crime	P	15	-0.12	0.07	0.12	-0.11	0.07	15	-0.11	0.07	17

Benefit-Cost Summary

The estimates shown are present value, life cycle benefits and costs. All dollars are expressed in the base year chosen for this analysis (2011). The economic discount rates and other relevant parameters are described in Technical Appendix 2.	Program Benefits					Costs	Summary Statistics			
	Partici- pants	Tax-payers	Other	Other Indirect	Total Benefits		Benefit to Cost Ratio	Return on Invest- ment	Benefits Minus Costs	Probability of a positive net present value
	\$1.375	\$3.084	\$7.643	\$1.565	\$13.667	-\$3.091	\$4.42	27%	\$10.576	94%


Detailed Monetary Benefit Estimates

Source of Benefits	Benefits to:				
	Parti- cants	Tax- payers	Other	Other In- direct	Total Benefits
Crime	\$0	\$2,380	\$7,784	\$1,207	\$11,371
Earnings via high school graduation	\$1,399	\$515	\$0	\$263	\$2,178
Health care costs via education	-\$24	\$189	-\$142	\$95	\$118

Detailed Cost Estimates

The figures shown are estimates of the costs to implement programs in Washington. The comparison group costs reflect either no treatment or treatment as usual, depending on how effect sizes were calculated in the meta-analysis. The uncertainty range is used in Monte Carlo risk analysis, described in Technical Appendix 2.	Program Costs			Comparison Costs			Summary Statistics	
	Annual Cost	Program Duration	Year Dollars	Annual Cost	Program Duration	Year Dollars	Present Value of Net Program Costs (in 2011 dollars)	Uncertainty (+ or - %)
	\$2,645	1	2004	\$0	1	2004	\$3,026	10%

Source: Anspach, D. F., Ferguson, A. S., & Phillips, L. L. (2003). Evaluation of Maine's statewide juvenile drug treatment court program. Augusta, ME: University of Southern Maine.



Multiplicative Adjustments Applied to the Meta-Analysis

Type of Adjustment	Multiplier
1- Less well-implemented comparison group or observational study, with some covariates.	1.00
2- Well-implemented comparison group design, often with many statistical controls.	1.00
3- Well-done observational study with many statistical controls (e.g., instrumental variables).	1.00
4- Random assignment, with some implementation issues.	1.00
5- Well-done random assignment study.	1.00
Program developer = researcher	0.36
Unusual (not "real-world") setting	0.50
Weak measurement used	0.80

The adjustment factors for these studies are based on our empirical knowledge of the research in a topic area. We performed a multivariate regression analysis of 96 effect sizes from evaluations of adult and juvenile justice programs. The analysis examined the relative magnitude of effect sizes for studies rated a 1, 2, 3, or 4 for research design quality, in comparison with a 5 (see Technical Appendix B for a description of these ratings). We weighted the model using the random effects inverse variance weights for each effect size. The results indicated that research designs 1, 2, and 3 should have a multiplier greater than 1 and research design 4 should have a multiplier of approximately 1. Using a conservative approach, we set all the multipliers to 1.

In this analysis, we also found that effect sizes were statistically significantly higher when the program developer was involved in the research evaluation. Similar findings, although not statistically significant, indicated that studies using weak outcome measures (such as technical violations) were higher.

Studies Used in the Meta-Analysis

- Anspach, D. F., Ferguson, A. S., & Phillips, L. L. (2003, September). *Evaluation of Maine's statewide juvenile drug treatment court program: Fourth year outcome evaluation report*. Augusta: University of Southern Maine.
- Byrnes, E. C., & Hickert, A. O. (2004). *Process and outcome evaluation of the third district juvenile drug court in Dona Ana County, New Mexico*. Annapolis, MD: Glacier Consulting.
- Carey, S. M. (2004, February). *Clackamas County Juvenile Drug Court outcome evaluation: Final report*. Portland, OR: NPC Research.
- Gilmore, A. S., Rodriguez, N., & Webb, V. J. (2005). Substance abuse and drug courts: The role of social bonds in juvenile drug courts. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 3(4), 287-315.
- Hartmann, D. J., & Rhineberger, G. M. (with Gregory, P., Mullins, M., Tollini, C., & Williams, Y.). (2003, March). *Evaluation of the Kalamazoo County juvenile drug treatment court program: October 1, 2001 – September 30, 2002, year 5*. Kalamazoo: Western Michigan University, Kercher Center for Social Research.
- Henggeler, S. W., Halliday-Boykins, C. A., Cunningham, P. B., Randall, J., Shapiro, S. B., & Chapman, J. E. (2006). Juvenile drug court: Enhancing outcomes by integrating evidence-based treatments. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 74(1), 42-54.
- Huff, D., Stageberg, P., Wilson, B. S., & Moore, R. G. (n.d.). *An assessment of the Polk County juvenile drug court*. Des Moines: Iowa Department of Human Rights, Division of Criminal & Juvenile Justice Planning & Statistical Analysis Center.
- Latessa, E. J., Shaffer, D. K., & Lowenkamp, C. (2002, July). *Outcome evaluation of Ohio's drug court efforts: Final report*. Cincinnati, OH: University of Cincinnati, Center for Criminal Justice Research, Division of Criminal Justice.
- LeGrice, L. N. (2004). Effectiveness of juvenile drug court on reducing delinquency. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 64(12), 4626A.

Studies Used in the Meta-Analysis

- Nebraska Commission on Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice. (2004). Tri-county juvenile drug court evaluation study final report. Lincoln: Nebraska Crime Commission, Author. Retrieved June 27, 2011 from http://www.ncc.state.ne.us/pdf/juvenile_justice_materials/2004_DTC_Report.pdf
- O'Connell, J. P., Nestlerode, E., & Miller, M. L. (1999, October). *Evaluation of the juvenile drug court diversion program*. Dover: State of Delaware Executive Department, Statistical Analysis Center.
- Parsons, B. V., Byrnes, E. C. (n.d.). *Byrne evaluation partnership program: Final report*. Salt Lake City: University of Utah, Social Research Institute.
- Pitts, W. J., & Guerin, P. (2004, June). *Evaluation of the Eleventh Judicial District Court San Juan County juvenile Drug Court: Quasi-experimental outcome study using historical information*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico, Institute for Social Research.